

of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order in place of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION UNVEILS TRANSPORTATION FUNDING PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, today the Bush administration unveiled its transportation funding plan for the next 6-year surface transportation bill. It is pathetically inadequate. If you look at the inventory of needs across the United States of America, the crumbling bridges, the crumbling highways, the congestion, the need for investment, the President and his staff believe that this budget should be flat-lined. We can't afford the investment, they tell us. We can't afford to invest more in roads, bridges and highways, in high-speed rail and congestion mitigation. We just can't afford it. Oh, we can afford massive tax cuts for the wealthy, but if we are going to have massive tax cuts for the wealthy, his number one job creation proposal, we can't afford to create real jobs, jobs in the construction industry.

By his own measure, by the measure of the Bush administration Department of Transportation, every \$1 billion spent on transportation infrastructure and construction produces 47,000 jobs in the United States of America. If the President would just increase his proposal to come close to that being made by the Republican Chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, they would create 705,000 new jobs a year in the United States of America; real jobs, construction jobs and related jobs in small businesses, and suppliers for those construction companies.

□ 1630

Instead, they want to engage in the charade of producing jobs through trickle-down economics and tax cuts. It did not work in the 1980's for Ronald Reagan. It did not work for George Bush the First, and it is not going to

work for this George Bush. In fact, his first tax cuts, which were record tax cuts, have not produced any jobs. We have lost nearly a million jobs since his first tax cuts. They have lots of excuses why we have lost those jobs since his record tax cuts went into effect. Mostly Bill Clinton, a few other things, world events; but they have got people to blame, and they are saying since those tax cuts did not work, let us borrow money from the Social Security trust Fund, from the Medicare trust fund; let us borrow money to fund more tax cuts because that is what we have to do now.

When we did that first set of tax cuts, we supposedly had a surplus. We no longer have a surplus. We have a huge and growing deficit. We are accumulating debt by more than \$1 billion a day; \$1 billion a day we are adding to the future debt of the young people of this country. And they want to borrow more money to finance tax cuts for woefully few people, an average of \$105,000 for every millionaire. But somehow they think that \$105,000 granted to every millionaire in this country in tax cuts will put more people to work than \$1 billion invested in crumbling bridges, roads, and highways.

It is pretty simple. We could put people back to work. We could make this a more productive country. We could make our transportation system work better. But, no. Tax cuts for precious few political campaign contributors are more important to this administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MUSGRAVE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the Special Order time of the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

NATURE CONSERVANCY AND PUTTING AMERICAN WORKERS FIRST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to briefly mention two very unrelated topics, but two things very important to the national scene. The front page of The Washington Post a few days ago had this headline: "Non-

profit Sells Scenic Acreage to Allies at a Loss. Buyers Gain Tax Breaks with Few Curbs on Land Use." And I would like for the Members to listen to the first few paragraphs of this story from the front page of The Washington Post. It says: "On New York's Shelter Island, the Nature Conservancy 3 years ago bought an undeveloped, 10-acre tract overlooking the Mashomack Preserve, an oasis of hardwoods and tidal pools located just a stone's skip from the exclusive Hamptons. Cost to the charity: \$2.1 million." That is what the Nature Conservancy purchased this land for.

"Seven weeks later it resold the land, with some development restrictions, to James Dougherty, former chairman of the charity's regional chapter, and his wife, Nancy, a trustee of the conservancy's preserve. Cost to the Doughertys: \$500,000.

"The transaction follows a pattern seen in conservancy land deals across the Nation. Time and again the non-profit has bought raw land and resold it at a loss to a trustee or supporter."

And what this article tells about, it tells about similar deals in Massachusetts, Kentucky, and other places across the country where the Nature Conservancy has bought land at a huge cost, \$2.1 million in this case, and resold it to a member of their board or a strong supporter at a great loss, \$500,000, for instance, in this \$2.1 million deal, some of the most beautiful land in this Nation. People across this country need to know that the Nature Conservancy is doing these types of sweetheart deals for its board members and other favored people around the country.

The other unrelated topic, Madam Speaker, another very important concern of mine is the fact that we keep on sending so many jobs to other countries. Just before the break, I spoke about another story from The Washington Post which told that one of the biggest exports we have in this country now is with the white collar or technical-type jobs, and it told that over the next decade we are going to lose at least 3 million or more white collar or technical jobs to places like India, China, and other countries.

The gurus or the supporters of high tech told us for years that we did not need to worry about losing the factory jobs and the lower-wage jobs to other countries, that we would be a service economy or that we would have the more educated type of jobs. Now we are losing those at a very alarming pace. And when I graduated from college, people could get good jobs with bachelor's degrees. Now young people are being forced to go to graduate school and sometimes are not even finding jobs when they have master's degrees or Ph.D. degrees, and that is why we find so many people in graduate school or even with graduate degrees working as waiters and waitresses around the country. And if we do not stop this, we are going to have a real problem in this country.